

**To:** Alisha Johnson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**From:** "Baltz, Tripp" <abaltz@bna.com>  
**Sent:** Thur 10/11/2012 4:23:28 PM  
**Subject:** RE: MEDIA request  
<http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/wy/pavillion/phase5.html>  
 image001.gif

Thanks, that's very helpful ... can you confirm the statements (below) made by DiGiulio? He is an EPA official, but I would hate to have it that we're going only with what industry and the state of Wyoming are characterizing about what he said.

[illegible]

Tripp Baltz

Staff Correspondent

BNA

Mobile 303.358.3371

abaltz@bna.com

From: Alisha Johnson [mailto:Johnson.Alisha@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2012 10:22 AM  
To: Baltz, Tripp  
Subject: Re: MEDIA request

Trip,  
Here is our statement on the data released yesterday:

EPA has released new monitoring data as part of the agency's ongoing analysis of ground water quality in the Pavillion, Wyoming area. These data were collected in collaboration with the United States Geological Survey (USGS), which conducted its own sampling at one of the wells. USGS data were released earlier. EPA's new data and the USGS data are generally consistent with the monitoring data included in EPA's December 2011 Draft Report on Pavillion Area Ground Water Investigation. The new EPA data, along with EPA's draft report and USGS data, will be submitted to an independent expert peer review panel. EPA is also taking public comment on the data and will be extending the comment period to January 15, 2013 to give stakeholders sufficient time to consider all data related to the Pavillion, Wyoming groundwater investigation. <http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/wy/pavillion/phase5.html>

Alisha:

Good morning. Would you please answer/confirm the following for a story I am doing this morning for BNA about yesterday's Pavillion Working Group meeting? Would it be best if I interviewed Martin?

1) CONFIRM: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will allow another three months (until Jan. 15) for public comment on controversial data from well testing near Pavillion, Martin Hestmark, a representative of the EPA's regional office, told members of the Pavillion Working Group at a meeting Wednesday in Riverton.

2) CONFIRM: The agency said in a statement that it decided to extend the comment period in order “to give stakeholders sufficient time to consider all data” related to the groundwater investigation.

3) ANSWER: What were the conclusions of the September 2012 Phase V Sampling Event Summary of Methods and Results?

4) ANSWER: If you cannot speak to its conclusions, what was the purpose of the Phase V Summary?

5) ANSWER: Is it true some attendees at the meeting also questioned the EPA's effectiveness in drilling the wells? How does EPA respond to that?

6) CONFIRM: Dominic DiGiulio, an EPA ground water researcher, told the group that the agency's second wall was erroneously logged as being made from stainless steel and reaching a depth of 980 feet. The actual well casing is made from thread and couple steel and actually reaches 989 feet.

7) CONFIRM: A camera snaked to the bottom of the well showed that a screen in the well is partially obstructed, but DiGiulio said testing showed that the obstruction was “corrosion material” that wouldn’t impact test results, continuing the agency’s ongoing assertion that the data from the second well can be used. “Low yield is not a justification to preclude sampling or disregard sampling results from a well,” DiGiulio said.

8) CONFIRM: The group didn't set a date for its next meeting, but it is expected to meet soon in Casper to review wellbore integrity data collected from wells in the field.

9) CONFIRM: DiGiulio said that it's hard to draw unflappable solutions from any data. "With any kind of science, there's always some uncertainty," he said. "We have a lot of data. It's impossible to say anything with 100 percent certainty."

Thanks!

[illegible]

Tripp Baltz  
Staff Correspondent

BNA

Mobile 303.358.3371  
abaltz@bna.com